UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,734	04/27/2001	Daryl Carvis Cromer	RPS920000031US1	1561

42640 7590 05/06/2005

DILLON & YUDELL LLP
8911 NORTH CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY
SUITE 2110
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER	
DINH, MINH	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2132	

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/844,734	CROMER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Minh Dinh	2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 December 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *4/27/2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 12/21/2004. Claims 1-3, 6, 8-11 and 15-17 have been amended.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are not persuasive. Applicant's amendments have necessitated a new search and new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 10-11, 13-15, 17-18 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gehrmann et al. (6,779,111) in view of Vollert et al (5,208,858).

Regarding claims 1 and 3-4 which are representative of claims 8, 10-11, 15 and 17-18, Gehrmann discloses a method comprising: receiving a request for a data transaction from a client lacking hardware cryptography functionality at a sever through

a secure connection between the client and the server (col. 1, lines 11-14; col. 1, line 65 – col. 2, line 16); utilizing security parameters specific to the client and encrypting the requested data transaction within the server on behalf of the client utilizing hardware cryptography functionality available within the server (fig. 2); and after encrypting the requested data transaction, forwarding the encrypted data transaction to a target of the requested data transaction as if originating from the client (fig. 2). Gehrmann does not disclose that the security parameters specific to the client are stored in the server and that, in response to said request, the server accesses a database at the server to obtain the security parameters. Vollert discloses a method for a server to process a request for generating an RSA digital signature from a client lacking hardware cryptography functionality (Abstract; col. 1, lines 33-47). Vollert further discloses that security parameters specific to the client are stored in the server and that, in response to said request, the server obtains the security parameters such as the user's public/private key pair (fig. 2, elements 9a-b; col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Gehrmann method such that the security parameters specific to the client are stored in the server and that, in response to said request, the server obtains the security parameters, as taught by Vollert. The motivation for doing so would have been that the user's private key could be securely protected at the server (col. 1, lines 33-47; col. 3, lines 33-47). Regarding the use of a database, Examiner takes Official Notice that using a database to facilitate data storage and retrieval is well known in the art. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention was made to modify the Gehrmann

method further to store the security parameters in a database since Examiner takes Official Notice that using a database to facilitate data storage and retrieval is well known in the art.

Regarding claims 6-7, 13-14 and 20-21, Gehrmann does not explicitly disclose that the server receives a response to the encrypted data transaction, decrypts the received response and forwards the processed response to the client. However, these limitations are deemed to be inherent to the Gehrmann method as line 65 of column 1 through line 7 of column 2 show that the time needed for the client to perform RSA encryption operations is unacceptable and so the client relies on the trusted server to perform those computationally expensive operations. The Gehrmann client would not have access to the plaintext response if the RSA-encrypted response were not decrypted by the proxy server first before being forwarded to the client.

5. Claims 2, 9 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gehrmann as applied to claims 1, 8 and 15 above, and further in view of Stallings (Cryptography And Network Security). Gehrmann does not disclose that the secure connection between the client and the server is an IPSec connection. Stallings discloses using an IPSec connection to secure communications (p. 400, fig. 13.1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Gehrmann method to use an IPSec connection between the client and the server, as taught by Stallings. The motivation for doing so would have been

that IPSec is transparent to applications so there is no need to change upper-layer software (p. 400-401, Benefits of IPSec).

6. Claims 5, 12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gehrmann as applied to claims 1, 8 and 15 above, and further in view of Stallings. Gehrmann does not disclose that the server forwards the processed data transaction via an SSL transaction. Stallings discloses using SSL to provide Web security in electronic commerce (p. 441, Introduction, "Virtually all business ... SSL/TLS and SET"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Gehrmann method such that the server forwards the processed data transaction via an SSL transaction, as taught by Stallings. SSL is becoming increasingly important as part of Web commerce.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Dinh whose telephone number is 571-272-3802. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri: 10:00am-6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MD

Minh Dinh
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

MD
4/13/05

GILBERTO BARRON JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100